

REMARKS

Receipt of the Office Action of June 17, 2011 is gratefully acknowledged.

Claims 19 - 28 and 30 - 36 have been examined in this RCE application with the following results: claim 19 is rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph because the phrase "querying the two databases" lacks sufficient antecedent basis; and claims 19 - 28 and 30 - 36 are rejected under 35 USC 102 (b) by DeWolf et al.

35 USC 112

Claim 9 has been amended to provide the antecedent basis for the two databases by specifically identifying each database. Claim 9 has also been amended to include the field device connection in the body of the claim rather than in the preamble. As such, the rejection under 35 USC 112 has been rendered moot and the field device connection should now be given its rightful weight.

35 USC 102

The rejection under 35 USC 102 by DeWolf et al is respectfully traversed.

DeWolf et al refers to a method and system for recording information related to assets, the method comprising: identifying the asset to be entered into an asset registry; assigning a unique identifier to the asset; recording the information related to the asset in the asset registry, wherein the information is associated with the unique identifier; categorizing the information related to the asset into multiple attributes; managing read and write privileges to the asset registry for various entities; and providing access to the attributes to the various entities that have an interest in the asset, wherein an entity having write privileges for a first attribute of the asset can write data related to a change in the first attribute of the asset to the asset registry, and an

entity having read privileges for a second attribute of the asset can read data related to the second attribute. In more detail DeWolf et al. refers to a computer system consisting of computers and a communication network and related software as well as a method of conducting business across the computer network. A Global Asset Information Registry (GAIR) is maintained and accessed by the asset owners and by any combination of organizations and individuals having a relationship to these assets. The GAIR contains, among other data, data regarding the object, the producer, the owner and other agencies or individuals with a stockholder's interest in the same.

DeWolf et al. does not give any hint in the direction that the manufacturer-specific information is only accessible to the manufacturer and the manufacturer-specific information contains information about spare-parts or information when the production of each of the field devices will end. The same is true with regard to the customer-specific information. When the Examiner states that a GAIR also contains, among other data, public data and non-public data, then this is not the same as what is described in the corresponding features: "electronically registering the field devices in a manufacturing data base, and electronically registering the field devices in a customer database". De Wolff et al. only refers to a database GAIR and not to two clearly separated databases as they are characterized in claim 19. Consequently DeWolf et al. does not give any hint in the direction that two clearly specified databases are electronically queried on the basis of maintenance criteria, whereby the query determines the optimal stock of the spare parts or consumable materials inventory for the chosen maintenance strategy.

It has previously been noted, and is again repeated, that DeWolf et al does not teach each and every step recited in claim 9. Some of the defects in DeWolf et al, with respect to 35 USC 102, are noted above, along what has already been noted in previously filed responses.

If DeWolf et al does not teach each and every step recited in the claims., then

U.S. Pat. Appl. 10/500,149

it cannot anticipate those claims.

Reconsideration and reexamination are again respectfully requested and claims
19 - 28 and 30 - 36 found allowable.

Date: October 17, 2011

Respectfully submitted,
BACON & THOMAS, PLLC



Felix J. D'Ambrosio
Attorney for Applicant

Registration Number 25,721

Customer Number *23364*
BACON & THOMAS, PLLC
625 Slaters Lane, Fourth Floor
Alexandria, Virginia 22314
Telephone: (703) 683-0500
Facsimile: (703) 683-1080

S:\Producer\jfd\CLIENTS\Endress+Hauser Holding GmbH\HERZ3001-PS0010\Oct. 17, 2011 Response.wpd